



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,871	08/18/2005	Mark Richard Ebden	06275-436US1/100795-1P US	5231
26164 7590 06/26/2008 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/26/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,871

Applicant(s)

EBDEN ET AL.

Examiner/Venkataraman
Balasubramanian/**Art Unit**

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-11 and 14-32 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 14, 19, 20 and 22-32 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11, 15-18 and 21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/31/2007.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9-11 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Method of use claims 9-11 are indefinite as they therapeutically effective amount.
2. Recitation of "prodrug" in claim 15 renders claim 15 indefinite for more than one reason. First of all claim 15 is an improper dependent claim as it fails to further limit claim 1. Note claim 1 has no prodrug. In addition, prodrug, in general and as noted in specification, are compounds, which undergo in vivo hydrolysis to parent active drugs. In that sense recitation of prodrug is acceptable. However, the definition of various variable groups include such groups, namely esters, amides, alkoxycarbonyl etc. and therefore it is not clear what is the difference between these variable groups and the prodrug groups. There is clear-cut ambiguity as to what is to be considered as prodrug and what is not. Applicants should note that if the variable groups are prodrug, which are in general inactive but becomes active upon in vivo transformation, then the compound bearing the variable group would be deemed as inactive which is not what the claim recites.

Art Unit: 1624

Furthermore, the issue on second paragraph is whether the structures of the claimed compounds are clearly defined. Applicants' "prodrug" are molecules whose structure lie outside the subject matter of formula (I), but upon metabolism in the body are converted to active compounds falling within the structural scope of formula (I). The claim describes the function intended but provides no specific structural guidance to what constitutes a "prodrug". Structural formulas, names, or both can accurately describe organic compounds, which are the subject matter of claim 1. Attempting to define means by function is not proper when the means can be clearly expressed in terms that are more precise.

3. Claim 16 is indefinite as it recites a combination therapy without reciting what disease the combination therapy is intended. In addition, the pharmaceutical composition in claim 16 requires additional ingredient. A composition requires more than one ingredient.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making prodrug of the claimed compounds. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art of medicinal chemistry - to use the invention. "The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized as the

quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims", In re Rainer, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, Ex parte Formal, 230 USPQ 546. a) Finding a prodrug, in this case in vivo hydrolysable ester is an empirical exercise. Predicting if a certain ester of a claimed alcohol, for example, is in fact a prodrug, and produces the active compound metabolically, in man, at a therapeutic concentration and at a useful rate is filled with experimental uncertainty. Although attempts have been made to predict drug metabolism 'de novo, this is still an experimental science. For a compound to be a prodrug, it must meet three tests. It must itself be biologically inactive. It must be metabolized to a second substance in a human at a rate and to an extent to produce that second substance at a physiologically meaningful concentration. Thirdly, that second substance must be biologically active. Thus, determining whether a particular compound meets these three criteria in a clinical trial setting requires a large quantity of experimentation.

b) The direction concerning the prodrug is found in the passage spanning pages 5-6 c) There is no working example of a prodrug of a compound the formula (I). d) The nature of the invention is clinical use of compounds and the pharmacokinetic behavior of substances in the human body. e) The state of the prodrug art is summarized by Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry). The table on the left side of page 976 outlines the research program to be undertaken to find a prodrug. The second paragraph in section 10 and

the paragraph spanning pages 976-977 indicate the low expectation of success. In that paragraph the difficulties of extrapolating between species are further developed. Since, the prodrug concept is a pharmacokinetic issue, the lack of any standard pharmacokinetic protocol discussed in the last sentence of this paragraph is particularly relevant. Banker (Modern Pharmaceuticals) in the first sentence, third paragraph on page 596 states that "extensive development must be undertaken" to find a prodrug. I) Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) in the last paragraph on page 975 describes the artisans making Applicants' prodrug as a collaborative team of synthetic pharmaceutical chemists and metabolism experts. All would have a Ph. D. degree and several years of industrial experience. g) It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", 'and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousands of compounds of formula of claim I as well as the presently unknown list potential prodrug derivatives embraced by the word "prodrug". Thus, undue experimentation will be required to determine if any particular derivative is, in fact, a prodrug.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In *re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is

clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Claims 10, 11, 16, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating rheumatoid arthritis and breast cancer, does not reasonably provide enablement for all or any human diseases or any or all conditions mediated by chemokine generically embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Following reasons apply.

The instant claim 11 is drawn to "a method for treatment of a human disease or condition in which modulation of chemokine receptor is beneficial while claims 10, 16 and 18 are drawn to treatment of cancer in general.

As recited, claim 10, 11, 16, 18 and 21 are reach through claims. A reach through claim is a claim drawn to a mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality in general format and thereby reach through a scope of invention for which they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

In the instant case claim 11, based on the modulation of chemokine receptor activity (chemokine receptor agonist/antagonistic activity) by the instant compounds, reach through treatment of any or all diseases or conditions including cancer and thereby they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

More specifically, in the instant case, based on the mode of action of instant

compounds as modulator of chemokine receptor activity, based on limited assay, it is claimed that the instant compounds are useful for treating of any or all diseases in general, including all cancers for which there is no adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the instant specification. In addition, these claims also imply that instant compounds are antagonists of any chemokine including those positively recited in the specification page 1 such as CCR1, CCR2, CCR2A, CCR2B, CCR3, CCR4, CCR5, CCR6, CCR7, CCR8, CCR9, CCR10 and CCR11 (for the C-C family), CXCR1, CXCR2, CXCR3, CXCR4 and CXCR5 (for the C-X-C 30 family) and CX3CR1 for the C-X3-C family.

The scope of the claims includes any or all diseases for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various diseases, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the chemokine receptor binding activity of the compounds provided in the specification at pages 29-31. The instant compounds are disclosed to have said chemokine receptor antagonistic activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in treating any or all diseases where chemokine is implicated, for which applicants provide no competent evidence.

The disease list would include asthma, allergic rhinitis, hypersensitivity lung diseases, hypersensitivity pneumonitis, eosinophilic pneumonias, delayed-type hypersensitivity, interstitial lung disease (ILD), idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis, ILD associated with rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus, ankylosing spondylitis, systemic sclerosis, Sjogren's syndrome, polymyositis or dermatomyositis,

Art Unit: 1624

systemic anaphylaxis or hypersensitivity responses, drug allergies, insect sting allergies', autoimmune diseases, such as rheumatoid arthritis, psoriatic arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus, myasthenia gravis, juvenile onset diabetes; glomerulonephritis, autoimmune thyroiditis, graft rejection, including allograft rejection or graft-versus-host disease; inflammatory bowel diseases, such as Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis; spondyloarthropathies, scleroderma; psoriasis (including T-cell mediated psoriasis) and inflammatory dermatoses such as dermatitis, eczema, atopic dermatitis, allergic contact dermatitis, urticaria, vasculitis, immunosuppression, including immunosuppression induced by chemotherapy, radiation therapy; disease relating to wound healing and burn treatment; therapy for autoimmune disease or other drug therapy (e.g., corticosteroid therapy) or combination of conventional drugs used in the treatment of autoimmune diseases and graft/transplantation rejection, which causes immunosuppression', immunosuppression due to congenital deficiency in receptor function or other causes; and infectious diseases, such as parasitic diseases, including but not limited to helminth infections, such as nematodes (round worms, Trichuriasis, Enterobiasis, Ascariasis, Hookworm, Strongyloidiasis, Trichinosis, filariasis; trematodes, visceral worms, visceral larva migrans (e.g., Toxocara), eosinophilic gastroenteritis (e.g., Anisaki ssp., Phocanema ssp.), cutaneous larva migrans (Ancylostoma braziliense, Ancylostoma caninum, the malaria-causing protozoan Plasmodium vivax, Human cytomegalovirus, Herpes virus saimiri, and Kaposi's sarcoma herpes virus, also known as human herpes virus 8, and poxvirus Moluscum contagiosum.

The scope of the claims includes any or all cancer or any or all proliferative diseases due to protein kinase inhibition including those yet to be discovered as due said mode of action for which there is no enabling disclosure. The scope of the claims includes any or all cancer based on the mode of action of the compound of instant claims for which there are no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims as recited would include treatment of various cancers such as lung cancer, bone cancer, pancreatic cancer, skin cancer, cancer of the head or neck, cutaneous or intraocular melanoma, uterine cancer, ovarian cancer, rectal cancer, cancer of the anal region, stomach cancer, colon cancer, breast cancer, uterine cancer, carcinoma of the fallopian tubes, carcinoma of the endometrium, carcinoma of the cervix, carcinoma of the vagina, carcinoma of the vulva, Hodgkin's disease, cancer of the esophagus, cancer of the small intestine, cancer of the endocrine system, cancer of the thyroid gland, cancer of the parathyroid gland, cancer of the adrenal gland, sarcoma of soft tissue, cancer of the urethra, cancer of the penis, prostate cancer, chronic or acute leukemia, lymphocytic lymphomas, cancer of the bladder, cancer of the kidney or ureter, renal cell carcinoma, carcinoma of the renal pelvis, neoplasms of the central nervous system (CNS), primary CNS lymphoma, spinal axis tumors, brain stem glioma, pituitary adenoma, or a combination of one or more of the foregoing cancers, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification.

Moreover many if not most of diseases such as psoriasis, lung cancer, brain cancer, pancreatic cancer, colon cancer etc. are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many anticancer drugs.

No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types, autoimmune diseases of all types, inflammatory diseases of all types and infections of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body.

Also see the PTO website

<<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/1_pecba.htm#7>>

ENABLEMENT DECISION TREE, Example F, situation 1) which is directed to the scope of cancers.

Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.". Clearly that is the case here.

Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists or clinicians today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally.

However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host.

Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; *In re Langer* 183 USPQ 288. Also note *Hoffman v. Klaus* 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 66 FR 1092-1099, 2001) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See *Rostene et al.*, *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 8, 895-904, 2007 and *Raman et al.*, *Cancer Letters*, 256, 137-165, 2007.

Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.". Clearly that is the case here.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating diseases that require chemokine receptor inhibitory activity.

2) The state of the prior art: Recent publications cited above expressed that the chemokine antagonist effects are still exploratory.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all condition of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all condition and the state of the art is that the effects of chemokine receptor antagonists are unpredictable and at best limited to modulation of inflammation.

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace any or all condition including

those yet to be related to chemokine receptor activity.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of receptor-ligand interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571)

272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624